

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/824,640	MALSKORN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Christopher B. McKinley	3781	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Christopher B. McKinley. (3) Dan Valencia.
 (2) Anthony Stashick. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 16 May 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 11 and 13.


Identification of prior art discussed: Hagano et al.(5,992,670).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


 ANTHONY D. STASHICK
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
 TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Regarding claim 1, Applicant contends that Hagano et al. does not disclose contact projections being in physical contact with the filler neck as claimed in the present invention. Regarding claim 13, in an effort to clarify the claim language and overcome a 35 U.S.C. 112 2nd rejection, Applicant distinguished an electrical contact from a physical contact as it relates to the top portion of a cap and the filler neck. Examiner respectively agreed and, in as much as all current actions are After-Final, further agreed to re-open prosecution upon receipt of a request for re-consideration from Applicant in light of the aforementioned information..